

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

MICHAEL NANNIS,

Plaintiff(s),

V.

SB GAMING LLC, et al.,

Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:19-cv-01894-JAD-NJK

ORDER

(Docket No. 14)

Pending before the Court is the parties' stipulation to permit the parties to file documents seal. Docket No. 14. The parties submit that "[g]ood cause and compelling reasons justify [under seal all documents subject to the Stipulated Confidentiality Agreement and Protective attached as Exhibit A] because th[o]se documents are within the State Court record and filed seal pursuant to the order of the State Court." *Id.* at 1, 2.

The Ninth Circuit has made clear that the fact that a court has entered a blanket stipulated protective order and that a party has designated a document as confidential pursuant to that protective order does not, standing alone, establish sufficient grounds to seal a filed document. *See Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1133 (9th Cir. 2003); *see also Beckman Indus., Inc. v. Int'l Ins. Co.*, 966 F.2d 470, 476 (9th Cir. 1992). Instead, a party seeking to file a confidential document under seal must file a motion to seal and must comply with the Ninth Circuit's directives in *Kamakana v. City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172 (9th Cir. 2006), and with Local Rule IA 10-5(a). The fact that another court has allowed the filing of certain documents under seal does not indicate that the parties have complied with the relevant federal

1 rules and caselaw. In fact, the parties' confidentiality order from the state indicates that no court
2 has made a determination that the relevant documents are appropriately under seal.

3 Accordingly, the parties' stipulation is **DENIED**. Docket No. 14.

4 IT IS SO ORDERED.

5 Dated: March 24, 2020

6 
7 Nancy J. Koppe
8 United States Magistrate Judge

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28